

REMARKS

Claims 21, 23-29, 32-36, 38-40, 42-48, 51-55, 57-59, 61, 63, 72-82, and 84-113 were pending in the application. All claims were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In response, certain claims have been amended, and others canceled from the application. The amendments are not an acquiescence to the rejections, but are offered to narrow the issues for either allowance or possible appeal.

The Applicants repeat the arguments filed in the Reply dated July 28, 2004. The Applicants arguments were that Schoolman was cited as the result of hindsight based on the Applicants claims and that Schoolman was not an enabling reference. No response to those arguments was provided. The Applicants also argued that Ohnsorge, even if combined with Schoolman, would at most suggest modifying the external display electronics of Schoolman. Even in its response, the Office fails to indicate how those external electronics would be integrated into the head-mounted housing of Schoolman.

As now recited in all claims, a display module is required by the invention. The recited display module at best requires an active matrix liquid crystal display, a light source, and a display driver circuit. The cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed structures as now recited.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By   
Rodney D. Johnson  
Registration No. 36,558  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136  
Rod.Johnson@hbsr.com

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

November 18, 2005